4: Schram M-5 (1911-1922) 1957 AE9 Monguor AE9

tually, Achia Bsan, reincarnation of the father of Tsong khapa, is the proprietor and chief of Kumbum.

The *Meng-tsang Fo-chiao shih* [71] notes that the series of his incarnations began in 1417 (two years before the death of his son, Tsong khapa!). It says that for fifteen incarnations Achia administered the monastery of Kumbum and was recognized as its chief and proprietor by the five tribes and the inhabitants of the seven valleys, and that he possessed a piece of pasture ground in Chahar. However, it notes also that, in 1746, the name of Achia Hutukhtu (his sixteenth incarnation) was drawn from the celebrated urn in Peking, and that an order was given to write the deeds of a pasture ground in Chahar. This text is a model of ambiguity and full of holes; it suggests that in 1746 Achia received for the very first time the title of Hutukhtu and that his name was registered on the roster of the Living Buddhas in the Mongolian Superintendency, although the process of reincarnation had begun in Lhasa only in 1475. Since deeds were then written, this implies also that at that time pasture grounds were granted to him for the first time. Thus, previous to 1746, no Achia reincarnation, chief of Kumbum, existed.

These assumptions seem to be supported by the fact that it was not in 1417, but in 1560, that some poor cells were built for the first time in Kumbum by lama Rintschen Dson dui tschamtso and his ten monks and also by the facts that in 1719 the emperor ordered Skal bzan rgyamts'o, chief of Kumbum, to invite T'u-kuan Hutukhtu to administer the monastery,[72] and that in 1723 mK'ampo Nomun-khan, head of the monastery of Kumbum and nephew of bLo Blzan bstan dsin, stirred the lamas to revolt and was made prisoner and the monastery was burned.[73] Until that time, not a single mention is made of Achia who, as head of the monastery and Hutukhtu, must have been the man responsible in such circumstances. However, the name of the real founder of the monastery is well known, as well known as the two other later heads and chiefs of the monastery.

It is a fact that Achia, created Hutukhtu only in 1746, had to remain in Peking, attached to the committee for the printing and translating of Tibetan books into Mongol, which was presided over by the second incarnation of the Chang chia. "In the last half of the 18th century it seems to have been the vogue for translators to ask Achia for a postscript to their translations. Many works printed at that time bear a postscript 'by

---

the suicide of Achia, there are no more lamas of Tibet in Kumbum. In 1746 the reincarnation of Achia received the title of Hutukhtu from the emperor. From that time on, according to the abbots, the prominent lamas of Kumbum have always been Monguors.

[71] *Meng-tsang Fo-chiao shih. History of the Buddhist religion in Mongolia and Tibet* 2: 143, 1935.

[72] Han Ju-lin, *Pien cheng kung lun, (Frontier Affairs)* 3 (5): 15, 1944.

[73] *Yung-cheng Shih-lu, ts'e* 145, *Chuan* 14: 10.

[36(A)]

4: Schram M-5 (1911-1922) 1957 AE9 Monguor AE9

Achia.'"[74] However, the myth of his previous existences was deeply rooted. "In 1686, a previous existence of Achia, the 16th, is said to have resided in the Yung-ho-kung temple of Peking, which had only been made a monastery in 1743. The roster of famous workers on the committee of translators at that time does not contain the name Achia."[75]

The emperor, after having drastically quelled the lama revolt, permitted the rebuilding of the monasteries of Erh-ku-lung and Seerkok, giving them the text of a less honorable stele to be carved, and imposing on Erh-ku-lung the new name of Yu-ning-ssu, and on Seerkok that of Kuang-hui-ssu. The chief of the monastery of Seerkok (Chie bsan rimpoche) having been beheaded, the Dalai lama in 1727 sent to Peking a learned lama, Tsanpo of Amdo, whom he himself had previously honored by the title of Nomun-kan. In order to rebuild Seerkok, the emperor granted him the title of Hutukhtu[76] and he became Min-chu-erh Hutukhtu, the new chief and proprietor of Seerkok. Since the chiefs of Erh-ku-lung had not plotted in the revolt, they were left undisturbed. Is it far-fetched to suppose that after the disappearance of mK'ampo Nomun-khan of Kumbum, on the request of the Dalai Lama, Achia became the new chief and proprietor of Kumbum in 1746 in the same way that Min chu-erh had become chief of Seerkok? It would have been a fine political gesture for the emperor to ennoble the father of Tsong khapa, chief of the Yellow Church, in order to regain the sympathy of the lamas of the whole Yellow Sect whose group in Hsining he had punished so severely for their irresponsible behavior. It is probably a unique case in the history of Lamaist reincarnations that a layman then became reincarnated as a Living Buddha.

ERH-KU-LUNG

While Kumbum was outgrowing its infantile period, there occurred the humble beginning of the monastery of Erh-ku-lung (1604), on the northern side of the

[74] Walter Heissig, *Die Pekinger Lamaistische Blockdrucke in Mongolischer Sprache*, 109, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1954.

[75] *Ibid.*, 110.

[76] *Meng-tsang Fo-chiao shih* 2: 125. However, Tsampo Nomun-khan of Amdo writes about himself in his well-known Geographical work, 29: "North of Ssi ling is the great monastery of Gahdan Tam Chhoi ling (seat of lama Tsampo Nomun-khan) in ancient times called Amdo Gomang gonpa; at present known as Serkhang gonpa." Sarat Chandra Das adds: "The author is an incarnation of an eminent lama named Tag tse chove, who was invited to be the abbot of the monastery. There are 2,000 monks, many know the Tshan nid philosophy." The work of Tsampo has to be read cautiously. Before 1723 there were 2,000 lamas; at the time of his arrival Seerkok was destroyed. On pages 29 and 30 he gives the names of 18 monasteries built north of Erh-ku-lung and says: "The monasteries are mostly subordinate to the Kumbum and Tsampopa [himself] abbots, in consequence of which those under Je gampo and Phagden have been converted in Gelugpa institutions." However, these institutions had been founded by Erh-ku-lung and nine of them by Seerkok, which abbots had always belonged to the Gelugpa or Yellow Sect.

[p. 26(B)]

4: Schram M-5 (1911-1922) 1957 AE9 Monguor AE9

reincarnations with an aura of glory. At Lhasa the lamas paid enthusiastic adoration to him. Their devotion went so far as to make them struggle and compete for the drinking of a draught of the water Chang-chia had used for his toilet.[92] Back in Peking, Chang-chia asked the emperor to return to the Dalai Lama the confiscated districts of Lit'ang and Batang, and to grant him a subsidy. Only a subsidy of 5,000 taels was allowed.[93]

Rolpa-dorje was also a learned man. His appointment by the emperor as chief of the commission for the revision of the translation into Mongol of the *Kanjur* and the *Tanjur*,[94] enhanced his prestige in the learned world, even as his learned works were studied in the colleges of Tibet, Mongolia, and Huang-chung (Huth, 291). In 1725 the Dalai Lama and Panchen Lama received imperial envoys, presenting them with a complete set of the *Kanjur*, together with its supplements, and the complete works of Tsong khapa and the first Chang-chia Hutukhtu.[95]

The Monguor Chang-chia Hutukhtus of Erh-ku-lung, conspicuous for their great abilities, extensive learning, high position at the Peking court, and former diplomatic missions, wielded an enormous influence in the highest Lamaist circles in Tibet. The appointment by the emperor of the regent Gyal ts'ab in Tibet, during the reign of the eighth Dalai Lama (1759–1804) was obtained by the influence of the Chang-chia II.[96] The influence which the Panchen Lama exercised over the temporal affairs of Tibet and the interest he enjoyed at the Peking court through his friend, Chang-chia, the lama primate, made the emperor, Ch'ien-lung, invite him to Peking, where he arrived in 1780 and died of smallpox.[97]

George Bogle in 1774–1775 was trying to get an agreement from the well-disposed Panchen Lama for Indian trade with Tibet. Even more important than the Panchen's promise to send envoys was his assurance to Bogle that he had written the Grand Lama at Peking, who had great influence with the emperor, informing him that the English were now masters of Bengal, that

---

[92] *Meng-tsang Fo-chiao shih, op. cit.*, 99.

[93] Petech, *op. cit.*, 162.

[94] Walter Heissig, Die Mongolischen Publication und Uebersetzungs Wesen der Mandjuzeit, *Sinologica* 3 (3): 205, 1953. Translations of Vols. 1 to 22 of the *Kanjur* by learned Mongol lamas already existed at the time of Ligdan Khan 1604–1634: the translation of 1717–1720 is almost textually the same as the former. The duty of Chang-chia, head of the committee, consisted in supervising the dogmatical genuineness of the translation. The Mongol translation of Dharani was published in 1759. More than 200 translations of Tibetan works still exist in Mongol.

[95] Petech, *op. cit.*, 9. One of the works of the second Chang-chia Hutukhtu is known in Europe through the translation of Eugen Pander, *Das Pantheon des Tschang tscha Hutukhtu*, Berlin, 1890.

[96] Rockhill, *op. cit.*, 46.

[97] *Ibid.*, 47. Schuyler Cammann, The Panchen Lama's visit to China in 1780, *Far Eastern Quart.* 9 (1): 6–18, 1949.

4; Schram M-S (1911-1922) 1957 AE9 Monguor AE9

T'u-kuan Hutukhtu

At the time when Chang-chia was at the height of his glory, T'u-kuan, another eminent Monguor lama of Erh-ku-lung, was on the way to becoming his equal. With Sumpa and Chang-chia he was considered the

---

Peking a biography of Chang-chia which had been translated into Mongol, in four volumes, by one of his most intimate pupils (p. 63).

Chang-chia II (1717–1786) was still a boy, living in Huang chung, at the time of the revolt of the lamas (1723). The emperor, in order to save the life of the new Chang-chia incarnation, forbade the army commanders to kill boys under fifteen years of age. Chang-chia was brought to Peking at the age of nine (1724). He studied Chinese, Mongol, Manchu, etc., with the son of the emperor, the future emperor Kao tsung (Ch'ien lung period, 1736–1796), and the twelfth prince, who became his friends (64). In the friendship which existed between Chang-chia, the future emperor, and the Manchu prince lies the explanation for the tremendous influence wielded by Chang-chia in Mongolia and Tibet. It also explains the prodigious activity displayed by the board for the translation of Tibetan books and the printing of Mongol books, of which Chang-chia was the chief. The Mongol lamas were elated by the publication of lamaist literature in Mongol, and the Mongol princes offered donations for its printing. Under the leadership of Chang-chia II, 99 lamaist works were printed in Mongol in Peking (p. 72). Chang-chia used his influence to change the trend of thinking of Mongol lamas, who were very fond of writing biographies of saints according to the pattern of the Geser epos (of Tibetan origin). He did not even allow the lamas to read or preserve the epos. It had not been reprinted in Peking since 1716 (87). However, he promoted the fusion (already started during the K'ang hsi period, p. 36) of the legendary Geser with Kuan ti, the Chinese god of war, and also their cult, making of them protectors of the country, to be worshipped by the Chinese military officials (p. 148). Chang-chia laid stress on the production of works in the dogmatic line (p. 106). The revision of the Kanjur was finished in 1720 (during the boyhood of Chang-chia II). From 1741 on, Chang-chia II, with a strong group of scholars, prepared the revision of the Tanjur which was finished in 1749 (p. 85). In 1780 the Panchen Lama attending the celebration of the seventieth birthday of the emperor in Jehol, composed a biography and eulogy in Tibetan of the fifteenth preexistences of Chang-chia II. It was translated into Mongol and was very popular in Mongolia and Tibet (p. 142), as was the biography of Chang-chia I, written by T'u-kuan Hutukhtu I (1737–1802) (p. 158).

The prodigious literary activity displayed during the lives of both Chang-chia I and II seems to have been notably reduced from the time of Chang-chia III on (1789–1846). In the meantime the Emperor Kao tsung, personal friend and protector of Chang-chia II died (1795); the Mongol princes had become less interested in offerings for the printing of books, and only a few lamas of Alashan continued to indulge in literary productions (165). In Heissig, not a name of a single author of Kumbum is noted during or after the period of this prodigious literary activity. Only ten new productions are noted during the nineteenth century, together with a few reprints of former books (p. 159). After the death of Chang-chia III (1846) his biography was written, starting with those of his previous existences (p. 168). Heissig notes that he does not understand why, in the historical sketch of the life of Chang-chia I, the biography of Chang-chia I written by T'u-kuan I of Erh-ku-lung is omitted (p. 167). He wonders also why the famous *History of the diffusion of Lamaism in Mongolia* written by T'u-kuan II was not printed in Peking (p. 3) during the time Chang-chia II was the chief of the imperial committee. The explanation for these pertinent questions will be

[p. 3](A)]

4; Schram M-5 (1911-1922) 1957 AE9 Monguor AE9

The master starts with the explanation of the text after the student has finished memorizing it, and so it happens that, after some time, one pupil is studying a second or a third book, while the others are still studying the first one. It is hard to teach pupils who have not received the same educational preparation and who progress at an unequal pace. The lack of elementary schools and high schools compels the master to adapt his teaching to the capacity and enthusiasm of each of the students, and inevitably the study loses its interest for pupil and master.

It is no wonder that very few learned lamas are encountered at present among the lamas of Huang-chung. The Living Buddha Goorong bzan, of the Red Sect, was the only man celebrated for his learning all over the country during the period 1910–1920, and he enjoyed this reputation among lamas of the Yellow Sect as well as the Red Sect. In Kumbum there was also a learned Living Buddha, Chao-hsi, who was said to have given instruction in the lamasery of Galdan in Tibet. In June, 1920, he was invited by the community of lamas of Kumbum to give instruction for ten days, and Kumbum seized this opportunity to invite all the lamas of Huang-chung to attend the ceremony, remembering that each attendant should offer a ceremonial scarf to the preacher, and bring his food with him. Kumbum, however, would offer two butter-teas to the participants each day. I was at Hua-yüan, a branch of Erh-ku-lung, at that time, and the intendant, in order to have his lamas attend the instruction, himself offered to provide them with the food for twelve days; but only 12 among the 58 lamas went to Kumbum.

In 1914 I was told that among the 3,000 lamas of Kumbum, 1,300 were members of the College of Philosophy, 350 of the College of Ritual, Magic and Astrology, 200 each in the College of Medicine and the College of Sacred Scripture and Monastic Rules. All these numbers have to be reduced according to the ratio previously noted for the 3,000 lamas of Kumbum, but the proportion is the same for the members attending the colleges. Thus, among the 3,000 lamas 2,000 or two-thirds were enjoying a higher educational training in the colleges, and they remained members of the colleges for the whole of their lives. This was generally true for all of the colleges of Huang-chung.

The reason for the unusual attendance at the colleges is not that these institutions are centers of higher education, but rather that they provide meals for their members. The richest colleges, able to give the greatest number and the choicest meals, are the best attended, such as the College of Philosophy. Another attraction of this very popular college, teaching the most arduous of all the sciences, is the relaxation provided by the public disputations. The schedule of the meals provided by the various colleges supports these statements:

[p. 64(A)]

4: Schram M-5 (1911-1922) 1957 AE9 Monguor AE9

1st month from 3rd to 18th, 3 cups of butter tea and tsamba, in all the colleges. 792
2nd month, all through the month, 3 cups and tsamba, for philosophers only. 557 873
3rd month from 11th to 16th, 3 cups and tsamba, in all the colleges. 814 262
4th month from 1st to 7th, 3 cups and tsamba, in all the colleges
5th month, all through the month, 3 cups and tsamba, for philosophers only.
6th month from 1st to 10th, 3 cups and tsamba, in all the colleges.
8th month, all through the month, 3 cups and tsamba, for philosophers only.
9th month from 15th to 19th, 3 cups and tsamba, in all the colleges.
10th month from 22nd to 29th, 3 cups and tsamba, in all the colleges.
11th month, all through the month, 3 cups and tsamba, for philosophers only.
12th monthly from 1st to 7th, 3 cups and tsamba, in all the colleges.

During the first, second, eighth, and eleventh months there is an exception. During each of these months, the philosophers four times enjoy two cups of rice, meat, and raisins. Rich pilgrims are accustomed to ask for special ceremonies and prayers more often in the College of Philosophy than in the other colleges, and each time they offer rice, meat, raisins, and alms. The philosophers thus enjoy more extra dinners than the members of other colleges, and receive greater shares at the distribution of alms. It is not amazing that a lama who can hardly make ends meet, but is endowed with a philosophical brain, considers it more educational to enroll in the College of Philosophy than in the others. Herein lies the practical attraction to the study of philosophy.

PREDILECTION FOR THE COLLEGE OF PHILOSOPHY, ITS CAUSES

The public disputations are the next attraction. Among the huge numbers of members of the College of Philosophy there are always some exceptions. Small groups of students are encountered who are genuinely interested in study and under the direction of competent professors invited by them, they undergo a severe course of instruction. Two or three times every week they are engaged in public disputations, attended by all the members of the college. Students studying the same book form the center of a numerous audience, squatting on the ground of the courtyard in the open air. These disputation exercises have been described by many authors; it is sufficient to record that the same circles always enjoy the biggest attendance, not for the interest of the subject disputed, which is rather mild, but in order to enjoy the virtuosity of celebrated de- 792 814 873

4: Schram M-5 (1911-1922) 1957 AE9 Monguor AE9

792 544 873

baters who are always the same and fond of displaying their ability.

Not a few among them are real actors, who would honor the stages of the best theaters in the civilized world. Their poses, mimicry, jokes, verve, double meaning suggestions, affected sounds, and their knack of keeping the people amused, whet the curiosity and provide a real relaxation. Nearly the whole community huddles around them, even the old lamas who are used to sitting sleepily at these compulsory, boring meetings, for whom the novelty has worn off many, many years ago, and who have never been interested in the subject itself, strain their ears and huddle a little nearer to the stage and relax happily.

The Yellow Sect has always been fond of dialectic. The T'u-kuan Hutukhtu of Erh-ku-lung was celebrated for his logic in the learned world of Tibet, Mongolia, and Huang-chung.[11] The dialectic methods of Nagarjuna are particularly enjoyed by the philosophers. He used to "prove," in the most incredible ways, the nonexistence of the world, of his proper self, and even of Buddhism.[12] The debaters try by means of recitation of endless memorized texts to stagger their opponents, and by tortuous questions to entice them into snares of sophism and to prove the most unbelievable theses. The attractive public disputations help to break the monotony of the monastic life, and to provide a couple of hours of relaxation.

It was said that once in a while some students passed official examinations and obtained titles and degrees, but I never had the opportunity to be present at such ceremonies.

Both these reasons explain the unusual attraction toward the College of Philosophy of the large number of lamas, who even lack the education of a student of an elementary school, and also the stubborn perseverance of the old lamas in continuing as members of the college.

792 873 794

The conditions for becoming a member of the other colleges and the method of study are identical with those of the College of Philosophy. The lamas have to attend only one compulsory service in the early morning in the main temple, as required by the organization of the community of the lamas, and have plenty of time to attend the exercises prescribed by other colleges in the morning and afternoon; they even have plenty of time to indulge in domestic duties and commerce. It would be instructive to make a comparison between the standard of the studies in Huang-chung and that of the celebrated lamaseries of Tibet, as described in nearly all the works concerned with the subject.[13] After investigating the situation in Huang-chung, I harbor suspicions concerning the punctilious observance of the pro-

[11] Huth, *op. cit.*, 281.

[12] René Grousset, *Philosophies indiennes*, ch. 9, *passim*, Paris, Desclée de Brower, 1931.

[13] Waddell, *op. cit.*, 184–188; Filchner, *op. cit.*, 350–358; Tucci, *op. cit.* 1: 94, etc.

wrought by barbarians in their country to indulge in such utopian hopes. They knew too well that more or less powerful tribes never had lived peaceably next to each other; that peace had reigned inside Mongolia and Tibet only as long as an all-powerful chief was able to subdue and to dominate the tribes, but that immediately after his death the tribes had always dispersed and began a new cycle of tribal wars. They knew too that barbarian conquerors had always tried to overcome China and had repeatedly succeeded in founding dynasties. In other circumstances Mongol and Tibetan tribes had only kept quiet along the Chinese frontiers so long as China had been able to wield sufficient military power to impose peace on them. The Chinese also knew very well that Lamaism had never changed the predatory instincts of the barbarians, and that the lamas in Tibet and Huang-chung had been just as savage warriors as the laymen. Once in a while Hutukhtus had tried to mediate the troubles among the tribes, but other influential chiefs of tribes and persons of standing had also tried, with comparable results of success or failure.

It is asserted that the Yellow Sect became an important power among the barbarians from the time when Gushi Khan, after conquering Tibet, installed the Dalai Lama as temporal chief of the country (1636), and that the Manchu dynasty recognized the fact. Before that time Lamaism was divided into sects, which supported the numerous political parties in the country fighting for supremacy. By mixing in politics and wars, and because of lack of unity, the influence of the sects was dissipated. The chiefs of the sects, however, craving titles and privileges, curried the favor of the emperors. The emperors were happy to comply with their requests, appreciating the asset of having friendly disposed influential chiefs in far-off countries, but always waited for an opportunity to use them to further the interests of the empire.

It was in this way that the Ming emperors (1368–1643) favored the lamas in Huang-chung, whatever their sect, by lavishly granting titles and privileges, and contributing to the building of monasteries in order to populate the desolate country, and to keep the Mongol tribes quiet after the overthrow of the Yüan dynasty.

Later on, when Lamaism had become a real power, the Ch'ing dynasty engaged in war with the Kalmüks or Western Mongols. Well aware of the influence which the Yellow Sect wielded among the eastern and western Mongols and its questionable behavior toward the empire, the Ch'ing dynasty imposed its authority on Lhasa by means of its armies, but at the same time granted favors and privileges to the lamas.

The institution of the committee for the translation into Mongol and the printing of Tibetan books dates from the Manchu period. This was a remarkable political provision. The most celebrated and learned lamas and Hutukhtus of the monasteries of Tibet,

[p. 160(A)]

4: Schram M-5 (1911-1922) 1957 AE9 Monguor AE9

Huang-chung, and Mongolia were appointed members of the committee. They were showered with honorific titles and privileges, and summoned to reside at the capital. The emperors lavishly provided for their expenses and those of their numerous disciples, and secured large temples and residences for their sojourn. The Mongol princes and the lamas of Tibet and Mongolia were elated with the generosity of the emperors and the keen interest and sympathy they displayed for their religion and for their spiritual chiefs. The emperors were happy too, realizing that it paid large dividends to have the most important and esteemed representatives of the lamaseries residing at the capital, in effect as honorable hostages, who had to ask the permission of the emperor every time they wanted to leave the capital.

However, these imperial generosities did not interfere with the strong policy implemented by the court in dealing with Tibet and Mongolia. They did not hinder the court in banishing the seventh Dalai Lama to Ssu-ch'uan, or in refusing to comply with the request of the "specially honored" Changchia Hutukhtu, to return to the Dalai Lama the regions of Li t'ang and Ba t'ang. They did not prevent the court from drastically crushing the lama revolt in Huang-chung (1723), or from burning all the monasteries in the country, even those of the "specially honored" Changchia. Later, at the request of the "beloved" Changchia and T'u-kuan, the lamaseries of Erh-ku-lung and Seerkok were allowed to be rebuilt. The emperor offered a contribution *ad hoc*, but two steles were to be erected recording the ungratefulness of the lamas and the new humiliating provisions for the lamas by decree of the court. The steles were erected, but built inside a wall and plastered by the lamas so that nobody could read the texts.

The policy of the emperors in promoting Lamaism has to be studied in the light of the facts. They were well aware of the predatory instincts and fickleness of the barbarians, and of the influence the lamas wielded among them. In order to further their own interests and to gain the sympathy of the barbarians, they lavished on the lamas the titles and privileges which they childishly craved; but they were not afraid to deal with the lamas and barbarians with draconian severity, whenever their behavoir was not in line with the imperial policy. An iron hand was in the velvet glove.

FAILURE OF LAMAISM TO TRANSFORM THE MONGUOR SOCIETY

This study also sheds light on the failure of Lamaism to transform the Monguor society into a genuine Buddhist society. In view of the really amazing bloom of Lamaism of the Yellow Sect in Huang-chung between 1600 and 1723, when more than forty monasteries were built in that relatively small country during that short span of time, and taking into account the tremendous number of lamas enrolled in them—one lama at least from every family—and the honors, titles, and privileges

[P-160(B)]